

Utah State University

**DigitalCommons@USU**

---

Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive  
Committee

Faculty Senate

---

12-2-2013

## USU Faculty Senate Minutes, December 2, 2013

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "USU Faculty Senate Minutes, December 2, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee*. Paper 188.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_fsexec/188](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_fsexec/188)

This Faculty Senate Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).





**USU FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES  
DECEMBER 2, 2013  
Merrill-Cazier Library, Room 154**

Yanghee Kim called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Yanghee Kim asked if there were any corrections to the minutes from the last faculty senate meeting (October 7, 2013). There were no changes, so the minutes were approved.

**Announcements:**

Yanghee Kim noted that both Joan Kleinke and Marilyn Atkinson – the faculty senate administrative assistant and secretary – are unable to be here today. We do not have the regular sign-in sheet and name placards – but passed around a list for all senators to sign to record attendance and demonstrate that we have met quorum requirements. Doug Jackson-Smith will take minutes and Renee Galliher will record the meeting.

**University Business – Provost Noelle Cockett**

President Albrecht was not able to be in attendance at this meeting.

Provost Cockett provided an update on the structure and implementation of the new USU Honors Program. After receiving helpful input from the faculty senate, Department Heads, and College Academic Advisors, the new program will provide flexibility that reflects the unique needs of each department and college and integrates with General Education requirements. A search committee to hire a new honors program director (chaired by Richard Mueller) has finalized and posted a position description. Faculty are encouraged to circulate the position description widely and can also nominate qualified individuals by sending names to Richard Mueller. The request for proposals for new honors classes received 17 course proposals. The Provost hopes to fund up to 12 of these classes to be initiated in fall 2014. College academic associate deans will submit recommendations for new courses to Deans in early January, and notification of approved courses will be made soon thereafter.

The Provost office is also working with College Deans to revise example templates for USU role statements to clarify that the standards of effectiveness and excellence in major and minor areas apply only to tenure and promotion decisions, and are not the evaluative standard for annual reviews. Once new templates are developed,

individual faculty will have the option to change to the new role statement format if they desire.

John Stevens asked if other changes to role statements might also be made during this revision process? In particular, the faculty forum noted that some role statements actively discourage service work – and there was interest in providing more support for faculty who invest in departmental, college or university service as part of their role in shared governance. No plans are in place to make other changes at this time.

Yanghee Kim noted that she sends out a summary of faculty senate meeting discussions and action items after each monthly meeting, and she will include an update on new role statement templates in the next summary. It is also important that all senators disseminate these short summaries to their colleagues to improve awareness of activities at US that relate to faculty interests.

### **Consent Agenda – Yanghee Kim**

Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report – Karen Mock  
Athletic Council Annual Report – Ken White  
EPC Items for October and November – Larry Smith  
ASUSU Report – Doug Fiefia  
Retention and Student Success – John Mortensen

Yanghee Kim invited questions and comments on any of the five reports on this month's consent agenda.

Ron Patterson pointed out two typographic errors in the FEC annual report – on page 1 should say USU Eastern (not USU-CEU) and page 5 should read 2014 (not 2104).

John Stevens asked Doug Fiefia about the survey of students related to common hour. Specifically, he was interested in whether the common hour might be moved to Monday or Friday – which would allow courses that meet on the other two days to be held M/W or W/F. Doug Fiefia was open to this idea – but noted it was not part of their survey. Could perhaps be asked in a future survey. Allen Stephens noted that survey results indicated most students were not using the common hour to attend convocations.

No other questions were raised. Renee Galliher moved to approve the consent agenda. Vince Wickwar seconded. Passed unanimously.

### **Information Items**

Yanghee Kim reviewed the notes from the Faculty Forum held November 4<sup>th</sup>. Doug Jackson-Smith asked what the plan is for the draft Post-Tenure Review code revisions (which were discussed at Faculty Forum). Yanghee Kim noted that this is on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate Executive Committee on December 9<sup>th</sup>.

Stephen Bialkowski noted that Section 202 of the University Policies and Procedures requires any code changes to come to faculty senate first, faculty senate should send with instructions to PRPC, then PRPC will present any code revisions to faculty senate for review and disposition twice – the first time as a reading (without a vote) and a second time for a formal vote.

Doug Jackson-Smith noted that he would like to see the AFT and BFW committees review and comment on the final PTR code revisions before a decision is made to send it to PRPC. Ideally they could provide feedback before the January meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Jenny Norton noted that colleges are currently using procedures that are not consistent with the existing faculty code (e.g., college-level review committees). The proposal needs to address whether or not the faculty review committee should be located at the departmental or college level. It is unclear whether current college committees violate the rights of faculty. Provost Cockett suggested that Deans were supposed to make participation in a college committee optional, and individual faculty could request a departmental quinquennial review committee. It is not clear if this has been done in practice.

Yanghee Kim also noted that faculty forum participants indicated a desire to see more rewards for faculty service and participation in shared governance. John Stevens noted that perhaps changes in role statements could be made to accommodate this.

### **Old Business**

Faculty heard a second reading of a change to faculty code 402.12.7 that corrected references to the annual Faculty teaching award. Robert Schmidt moved to approve the changes. Steve Mansfield seconded. It passed unanimously. Stephan Bialkowski asked the parliamentarian to check if we had a quorum to allow this vote. A quick review of the sign-in sheet and count of participants from distance campuses indicated that we have 40 senators present – enough for a quorum.

### **New Business**

Yanghee Kim presented a proposal to change the wording in the faculty code (section 402.4.2) that outline the ‘order of business’ for faculty senate meetings to utilize more intuitive categories and to be more compliant with Roberts Rules of Order. The core changes include: combining announcements and information items into a single ‘information items’ category; renaming ‘consent agenda’ to be ‘reports’; and renaming ‘old business’ to ‘unfinished business.’ PRPC has submitted formal code language to effect the change. Scott Bates asked whether new business would be a change with existing practices (e.g., would it allow business to be initiated on the senate floor?). Yanghee Kim indicated that these changes would not alter the ways we conduct senate faculty senate meetings – only clarify and simplify the order of business. Scott Bates moved to approve the new language on a first reading. Steve Mansfield seconded. It passed unanimously.

Steve Bialkowski raised a concern that the faculty senate was out of order since the coded does not allow a vote on a first reading. Discussion of faculty senate procedures ensued. The parliamentarian confirmed that a vote is not required on a first reading.

Yanghee Kim then introduced a second proposed code revision for a first reading. This change would add a phrase “including the campus or center location” to the relevant sections of code addressing the role statement (405.6.1). Andrew Walker asked for clarification why this change is being made. Comments from Bob Mueller suggested that this mostly protects regional campus faculty from being forced to change their primary work location without their consent. No other comments were made during this first reading and no vote was taken (consistent with the comments noted above).

Yanghee Kim presented a third proposed code revision for a first reading. This proposal would facilitate a formal change throughout the entire faculty code to reflect a recent change in the name in the USU student association (from ASUSU to USUSA). Since this change impacts many sections of code, the delineation of all of the specific changes in each section was not distributed with the agenda. Doug Jackson-Smith moved that we suspend faculty senate rules to allow us to hear the first reading without seeing the full edited code text today, to give permission to exclude this extensive (but relatively uncontroversial) edit from the official faculty senate agenda packet next meeting, and instead to ask the senate leadership to post a copy of the edited code text on the faculty senate website before the second reading at our January meeting. Steve Mansfield seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Stephan Bialkowski asked if he could bring up a new item for senate discussion. Yanghee Kim pointed out that this is normally not allowed out of respect for the faculty senators time – and that new business should be run through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to request a place on the official agenda. Charles Waugh noted that if everything has to come through FSEC, it puts a great deal of power in their hands and he’d prefer to have a place on the regular faculty senate agenda for things to be raised from the floor. Yanghee Kim noted that the code does allow a senator to raise new business without going through FSEC, but that a motion requires signatures from 25 senators. Steve Bialkowski suggested that code allows PRPC to bring business up at the Faculty Senate without FSEC consent. Some discussion ensued about this point. Doug Jackson-Smith moved to suspend senate rules to allow presentation of new business (for this meeting only). Robert Schmidt seconded the motion. It passed by majority voice vote. Stephan Bialkowski proposed a code change for section 402.12 (which describes the functions of PRPC) that would add a sentence requiring them to ‘be cognizant of section 202 of University Policies and Procedures.” Steve Mansfield moved to refer this idea to PRPC for code revision drafting. Andrew Walker second the motion. It passed unanimously.

**Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.